Published on the 15th of the month

Vol. XXIX, No. 8 NOVEMBER, 1939

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the Pacific LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
The War and the Church	415
An American View-Point	419
Archbishop Temple and a Dedicated Nation ..	420
God's Responsibility for the War	422
A Theological Jubilee	423
A New Effort towards Christian Unity ..	425
Christian Experience and Speculative Doctrinal Expression	430
H. Bullock, M.A., B.D.	
Composure: Our Present Need	440
Kenneth Henderson, M.A., B.Litt.	
Spirit-Bearing	444
The Bishop of Truro.	
Endure	446
Hubert Handley, M.A.	
Book Reviews:	
The Moral Route to Religion	451
Popes without Haloes	453
The Philosophy of Courage	454
Social Religion in America	455
Short Notices	458
Correspondence	458
J. R. Lowell's Attitude to War; Dr. A. E. Taylor and Proofs of a Future Life, &c.	

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1s. net Annual Subscription, 10/6

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

The Modern Churchmen's Union

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.
Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President:
Sir CYRIL NORWOOD, D.Litt., President of St. John's College, Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

THE MASTER OF THE TEMPLE, M.A.
The Right Hon. Lord CHARNWOOD.
The Hon. GILBERT COLERIDGE, M.A., J.P.
G. G. COULTON, Esq., D.Litt., F.B.A.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
ARTHUR GRAY, Esq., M.A.
Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A. [F.B.A.
Professor S. H. HOOKE, M.A., B.D.
Very Rev. W. R. INGE, K.C.V.O., D.D.,
Rev. Prof. F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D.
Sir LAWRENCE JONES, Bt., M.A.
R. W. MACAN, Esq., D.Litt.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Very Rev. the DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S, K.C.V.O., D.D.
Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
Rev. Canon C. E. RAVEN, D.D.
Rev. KARL REILAND, D.D.
Rev. Canon T. GUY ROGERS, M.C., B.D.
THE MASTER OF CHARTERHOUSE, M.A.
Rev. Canon V. F. STORR, M.A.
Rev. F. R. TENNANT, D.D., B.Sc., F.B.A.
J. W. WALKER, Esq., M.D., O.B.E., F.S.A.
DOUGLAS WHITE, Esq., M.D.
Sir ARNOLD WILSON, M.P.

Members of the Council, 1939-40:

Chairman: R. B. HENDERSON, Esq., M.A., B.D.

Miss A. M. ASHLEY, M.A.
Miss E. M. BEAUMONT.
Rev. J. S. BOYS-SMITH, M.A.
Rev. K. G. BUDD, A.K.C.
Rev. G. W. BUTTERWORTH, M.A., Litt.D.
T. J. CHILDS, Esq., B.A.
Rev. L. B. CROSS, M.A.
E. T. ENGLAND, Esq., M.A.
Miss W. M. FAYERMAN, M.A.
W. P. FULLER, Esq., M.A.
Rev. P. GARDNER-SMITH, B.D.
Rev. R. G. GRIFFITH, M.A.
Rev. G. L. H. HARVEY, M.A.
Miss HILDA HUBBARD.
Rev. R. G. JACKSON, B.A.
S. K. JONES, Esq., B.A.
GUY KENDALL, Esq., M.A.
Rev. T. H. H. KILBORN, B.A.
Rev. H. P. KINGDON, M.A.
Rev. A. R. C. LEANEY, B.A.
Rev. Canon W. H. MACKEAN, D.D.
Rev. T. H. W. MAXFIELD, M.A.
Rev. Chancellor H. G. MULLINER, M.A.
Rev. J. K. NETTLEFOLD, M.A.
Rev. R. B. PARKER, B.Sc., B.A.
Rev. F. I. L. REES, M.A.
Rev. ALAN RICHARDSON, M.A.
Rev. Canon R. D. RICHARDSON, M.A., B.Litt.
Rev. A. F. ROBSON, M.A.
J. H. SIMPSON, Esq., M.A.
Rev. A. H. STREETEN, M.A.
Rev. Canon NORMAN SYKES, M.A., D.Phil.
Rev. H. J. TRUEMAN, M.A.
H. F. WALKER, Esq.
Miss DOROTHY WARD.
Rev. J. R. C. WEBB, B.D.

Office—520 GRAND BUILDINGS, TRAFALGAR SQUARE, W.C.2.
Organizing Secretary—Rev. T. J. WOOD, M.A., St. John's Vicarage, 384 Clapham Road, [S.W.9.
Assistant Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Treasurer—Sir JOHN BARRAN, Bart., Sawley Hall, Ripon.
Bankers—MIDLAND BANK, METHODIST HALL BRANCH, S.W.1.

AIMS OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

1.—To affirm the progressive character of God's self-revelation, and the certainty that no truth can lead away from Him.
2.—To proclaim Christ and His Gospel in the light of modern knowledge, endeavouring to give a clear meaning to all phrases which are open to ambiguous treatment.
3.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to reject what is false and to restate what is true in her traditional dogmas.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the study of the Bible according to modern critical methods, and to interpret its message in the light of such study.
6.—To secure more regard for beauty and truth in Church Services and the use of language and customs in harmony with modern thought.
7.—To promote the application of Christian principles in public as well as in private life.
8.—To assert the right and duty of the laity to take a due share in the government and work of the Church.
9.—To maintain the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England and to foster fellowship and co-operation in Word and Sacrament with other Christian Societies.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 10/-; Associates, 2/6; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to The Modern Churchmen's Union, and crossed 'Midland Bank, Wesleyan Hall, S.W.1.'

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Organizing Secretary, Modern Churchmen's Union, 520 Grand Buildings, W.C.2.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1939. Vol. XXIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The War and the Church.

The Modern Churchmen's Conference at Girton concluded on September 1, the day on which Germany invaded Poland. Two days later, on Oliver Cromwell's fortunate day (may God grant to this nation a like succession of 'crowning mercies'), Great Britain declared war on Germany. A great Oxford don, as learned as he was absent-minded, found himself at a railway station and telegraphed to his wife: 'Am I where I ought to be?' She replied: 'Look at your ticket.'

The question for every Englishman to-day in regard to the war is: 'Are we where we ought to be?' And the answer is: 'Look at your ticket.' Our ticket indicates that our destination is 'International Peace,' and that the station from which we started was the 'Appeasement Policy,' followed by the 'Anti-Aggression Pact' and now by 'War with Germany.' There was no alternative route, although our Prime Minister made many desperate and unavailing efforts to find such. We are where we ought to be, because, having set out on our pilgrimage to the City of International Peace, we, like Bunyan's pilgrims in Vanity Fair, must needs pass that way.

England and her ally, France, are to-day doing the work which the League of Nations failed to do. They are doing it, not by the method of interminable conversations in the spacious

halls and comfortable committee rooms of Geneva (where, alas! every national sacrifice was shirked and every weak and trustful member of the League thrown to the wolves), but in the trench, the submarine, the fighting plane; amid danger, suffering and death.

The present war is a crusade—not the only War of the Cross fought in our troublous Christian history—but one of the most satisfactory ever fought in response to the appeal of Christian principles. The most convincing presentation of the case from this point of view, we owe to the pen of Bishop Hensley Henson in a letter to the *Times* of September 15, from which we give the following extract:

> 'The unanimity of opinion and feeling which now prevails in the nation on the subject of the war is, so far as my knowledge extends, unprecedented. It is also deeply suggestive and heartening, for it is not merely national or political but has its counterpart throughout the sphere of Western civilization.
>
> Germany has entered on this fearful conflict with the moral disadvantage which is implicit in the condemnation of the non-German world. She is under a heavier interdict than any which the medieval Papacy, even in the climax of its moral authority, could impose. For "the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord," and there can be no more trustworthy certificate of the Divine Mind than the general verdict of the civilized conscience. In striking for justice, liberty and international law we may be assured that (I borrow Bishop Butler's phrase) we are "on the side of the Divine administration."
>
> The effect of such an interdict is not immediately apparent, but it is none the less real, and it gathers strength with time. It creates an atmosphere in which every factor of doubt and weakness within the population affected is strengthened and every exertion is depressed. A creeping doubt takes the heart out of effort and an ill conscience gives dismal suggestiveness to every untoward incident. In Germany there must be many bitter resentments, many troubled consciences, many perplexed minds. Germany, like Shakespeare's Richard III, must enter the final conflict escorted by the ghosts of her victims. Jews, Communists, Christians, alike Roman and Protestant, Austrians, Czechs, and now the murdered Poles, represent a cumulative condemnation which not even the adroitest diplomacy, or the cunningest sophistry of mendacious propaganda, or even the firmest valour can finally sustain.
>
> Therefore I do not hold with those who would minimize the issues at stake, or seek to shrivel our warfare into something restricted and normal. It is a crusade for the rescue of the ultimate factors of Christian civilization, and we need the faith and fervour of crusaders if we are to achieve victory.'

Unpractical pacifists and squeamish ideologists will no doubt shudder and protest at the claim that the present war is a crusade. They will remind us that the cry, *Dieu le veult*, uttered

by the multitudes in response to the impassioned eloquence of Peter the Hermit, preaching the First Crusade, inaugurated a series of barbarous wars and involved torrents of human blood without making any real contribution to the progress of civilization. Let it be admitted at once that many crusades, such as the Albigensian, were not crusades at all.

Too readily have Christians sought to make God their accomplice in their unchristian wars. The Bishop of Chichester, in a letter to the *Times* of September 13, cites with poignant effect 'The Dilemma,' written during the Great War:

> 'God heard the embattled nations sing and shout
> Gott strafe England! and God save the King!
> God this, God that, and God the other thing—
> "Good God," said God, "I've got my work cut out."'

Nevertheless there are, as Article xxxvii allows, righteous wars in which Christian men may fight, and, as we should hold, not only 'may' but 'must' fight, if the world is not to be handed over in its international relations to injustice, bad faith, oppression of the weak, enslavement of the free, and to that brute force, in league with greed and treachery, which is ever ready to enslave and rob mankind.

In this connection we venture to cite the words of a great Victorian preacher[1]:

> 'We are not bound to calculate all the possible consequences of an act to which Duty calls us: but we *are* bound, before we take a single step into such an awful future, to make sure that we take it in a spirit that can challenge any consequences, and not fall back. It is true that we have but a choice of terrible evils and that war is the greatest of crimes. But are great crimes not to be resisted? Are great criminals to be the undisputed Masters of the world?
>
> The enormity of wars of ambition, of selfishness, of aggression, is the very circumstance that makes it a duty to withstand them. True, War is the bane and reproach of mankind, but so is all crime, in its measure—so is murder, so is robbery, so is lust. But is the Murderer to be unrestrained? Is the Robber to go at large? Is the Spoiler to spoil where he pleases?
>
> And if War is all these in one, is not the civilized world to band itself against the aggressor, or is this world where God would set up His Kingdom to be given over to high-handed wickedness? The more you prove the wickedness of War, the more you prove it to be the Duty of the Nations to unite against him who unrighteously resorts to it, as against the common enemy of mankind.'

A clear head, a strong grasp of Christian principles, and a sensitive moral consciousness are needful if the Christian

[1] The Rev. John Thom, cited in *The Inquirer* of Oct. 13, 1939, p. 458.

Church is to take the right line in this time of crisis. We must beware of espousing a narrow nationalism and appealing to the brutal side of human nature. The gutter press, the purveyor of popular amusements, and the infuriated and unreasoning patriot are ever ready to do this. 'Patriotism,' said Dr. Johnson on one occasion, 'is the plea of every scoundrel,' and although patriotism can be, and often is, a very sincere, unselfish and profound emotion, the less the Church makes appeal to it, at the present time, the better. We did not enter this war primarily for patriotic purposes, but in the interests of international peace, and the more the Church keeps that purpose in view the better it will serve the interests of all. By so doing it will be true to the ideal of its Founder, the Prince of Peace.

Dr. Barth, in his tremendous indictment under five heads of the Hitlerian policy and practice, provides Christian leaders in this land with an example of how this should be done in a Christian pulpit. Whilst emphasizing the rightness of our cause and the need for whole-hearted and strenuous self-sacrifice in support of it, the Church must beware of encouraging a spirit of national self-righteousness. We ought not, as a nation, to regard ourselves as entirely blameless. Lack of foresight, lack of moral courage, lack of a noble generosity, certainly helped to create the situation out of which Hitlerism sprang. The realization and remembrance of these things should guard us against self-righteousness. But we must be very careful here not to allow our own past unrighteousness to be used as a detrimental argument against the righteousness of our present action. That kind or argument is not divine but diabolical, since it stultifies moral effort and defeats that true repentance which resolves this time to do better than it did last time — the only method of climbing the ladder of Christian perfection.

Many Christian men have been led to the brink of spiritual despair by speculating as to whether they have in their past lives committed the sin against the Holy Ghost of which our Saviour speaks in the Gospels. This has been due to their misunderstanding and misinterpretation of that passage. On the other hand, many other Christian men have gone very close to committing that sin, or have actually committed it, without experiencing any conscientious scruples. Sin against the Holy Ghost consists

in the deliberate confusing of moral issues by assigning evil reasons for good actions. It is condemned, not only by Jesus, but also by one of the greatest of the Hebrew prophets :

> ' Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil ; that put darkness for light and light for darkness.'

It is against this sin that the Church itself in this hour of peril and darkness must sedulously guard itself and guard the nation also.

An American View-Point.

We have received the following letter from the Chaplain of the American pro-Cathedral in Paris addressed to his fellow-countrymen in the columns of *The Living Church*, U.S.A., and are glad to re-publish it in our pages.

Sir,

In a report of the Peace Conference held at Geneva, so ably written for *The Living Church* of August 23 by the Bishop of Albany, there occurred a line which impels me to write. It betrays a position taken by some of our Church leaders at home and abroad which, by the logic of events and the evidence, needs re-study.

In reporting the deliberations of this Peace Conference, the writer says : ' It included also a number of suggestions for the Church in war time which we hope may prevent the Church ever again acting as a recruiting sergeant for the State or proclaiming a holy crusade.'

The direct implication is that the Church has acted, and wrongly acted, as ' a recruiting sergeant for the State.' The writer undoubtedly refers particularly to the war of 1914-18. Whether the position of this Peace Conference is that no war can be a holy war is not stated, but that issue is raised not only as to the World War, but, what is more timely and important, as to the war Germany launched on Sept. 1st.

I have yet to find among Christian men in Europe (I have not talked with Germans) a man who does not regard the defence of Poland by the Poles, the British and the French as a holy war. The evidence against the German leaders as cold-blooded, designing and perjured international gangsters is so conclusive that it can find no defenders in any neutral country in Europe. Before September, certain writers, citizens of Germany's two silent partners, Italy and Russia, supported Germany weakly but without conviction. Since September 1st, even they have been silent. To resist by every means gangster attacks upon a peaceful neighbour (who had already agreed to submit every German claim to a fair tribunal) with the sole object of physical domination and enslavement of their victims, while at the same time threatening the destruction of the best, Europe and the world has attained in advancing civilization, is certainly a holy defence, justified before God and man.

As to the war of 1914-18, although the evidence as to culpability was not as crystal clear as that of 1939, yet those students of the former war who held then and hold now that the fundamental and proximate cause of that world tragedy was the determination of the German leaders to brutally dominate their neighbours, are strengthened

in their position in the light of recent events. On the contrary, those who were influenced by propaganda and evidence, the object of which was to prove that 'everyone was at fault,' etc., but which has never been able to stand the light of fair-minded research, are now finding their position more and more untenable.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the designs and methods of the German leaders of 1914 were exactly the same as those of 1939, and that we are now faced with a renewal of the German offensive which failed in 1918.

To fight for the Right in its struggle against brutal, perjured wrong, to defend Civilzation by peaceable means if possible (as England, France and Poland during the past anxious months tried so hard to do), but if not possible, then at all costs, this is Europe's supreme duty and calls for the sympathy and support of all right thinking men within and without the Christian Church.

FREDERICK W. BEEKMAN.

American pro-Cathedral Church of the
Holy Trinity, Paris.
Sept. 16, 1939.

Besides being strenuously warned that we ought to beware of making the Church the 'recruiting sergeant for the State,' we are also warned that we must teach our fellow-countrymen that 'force cannot overcome force.' This is interpreted as meaning that 'force must not be used to overcome force.' Both these aphorisms are open to serious question. The saying that 'force is no argument' is entirely sound, as is also the warning that force *alone* ought not to be used by rational, moral and spiritual beings to overcome the wrongful violence of other human beings. There is no hope for permanent victory if the use of force is not inspired and controlled by rational, moral and spiritual ideals. In such a case force is not the master of man but his servant, as it is the servant of God.

ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE AND A DEDICATED NATION.

Dr. Temple, in a notable broadcast of October 2, declared that we entered the war as a dedicated nation. It was this sense of dedication which 'has called forth the response of the younger generation in so marvellous a manner.'

> 'The prevailing conviction is that Nazi tyranny and aggression are destroying the traditional excellence of European civilization and must be eliminated for the good of mankind. Over against the deified nation of the Nazis our people have taken their stand as a dedicated nation.'

It is the duty of the Church to extend, deepen, clarify and maintain this sense of national dedication. It is no easy task, and will become more difficult as the stress and strain of the

war increases. This sense of dedication has many enemies, not simply materialism, cowardice and self-indulgence, but political partizanship, unscrupulous profiteering, official blundering and popular vulgarization of our high endeavour. All these can and will contribute to the weakening of this sense of national dedication to a great cause. Against these forces of deterioration and corruption, the Christian Church, as a source of moral and spiritual energy, can exercise a vitalizing and antiseptic influence. 'Ye are the salt of the earth'; 'Ye are the light of the world,' said Jesus to His disciples—the salt which saves the nation from moral corruption; the light which shines in the midst of the darkness which would obliterate the truth.

Our pulpits, on the one hand, should voice no spirit of blatant jingoism, militarist imperialism, detestation of the German people, but, on the other hand, we should equally guard ourselves against the insidious temptation of weakly compromising moral and spiritual issues. We who are living sheltered lives in a country protected by the disciplined courage and heroic self-sacrifice of our fighting forces, should strive in our home circles to promote the spirit of calm cheerfulness and uncomplaining patience which readily recognizes that war-time inconveniences and restrictions which we may be required to experience are nothing to the sacrifices endured by many of our fellow-countrymen on active service. Our Government in its meticulous, and in many ways admirable, endeavour to emulate the White Knight by preparing for every eventuality and so protect its home population from every kind of danger, has unwittingly encouraged the funk-hole spirit among the more timid and self-regarding members of the nation. Church authorities who advocate church worshippers crawling under pews at the time of an air raid are falling below those ideals of Christian courage and fortitude which characterize the spirit of the New Testament, and have always characterized the true Christian in every subsequent age of the Church. The late Archdeacon Mackarness of Scarborough, who in the Great War continued unperturbed the celebration of the Holy Communion when a German shell crashed through his church, is a sound example of that type of conduct by the home-dweller which strengthens both ourselves and others.

GOD'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE WAR.

The *Church Times* of October 27 published an excellent contribution by Canon Peter Green of Manchester in answer to the question: Why did not God prevent the War?

Everyone who charges the Creator with the guilt of the War, or thinks that He could, as a rational, moral and spiritual Being, have prevented the War, will do well to study Canon Peter Green's argument. Canon Green's conclusions may be summarized thus:

> '(i.) God did not "send" the war, nor desire the war. It is the result of the sinful wills of sinful men, and the responsibility is theirs, not His. And when we say that, we shall be wise not to suppose that all the sin is with Germany, or all the guilt on one side.
>
> (ii.) Though God did not will the war, He did allow it, or it could not have happened.
>
> (iii.) If He allowed it, He allowed it for some good purpose, and our wisdom will be to accept His will humbly and not to "charge God foolishly."
>
> If we ask why God allowed it, I think we may offer many answers. We may think of God as a wise, loving and just Schoolmaster who punishes his boys. In 1919 we had the chance of building a new world on a foundation of love and justice. We chose the way of punishment and revenge, and must not now be surprised if, having sown thorns, we do not reap grapes. Or we may think of God as a great Surgeon who performs an operation, painful indeed, but full of hope for recovery. Can anyone suppose that the world between 1919 and 1939 was healthy in God's sight? Or we may think of Him as a Farmer burning off weeds to clear the field for a better crop. Could anyone wish our present civilization to continue unchanged?'

There are two further questions:

(i.) Is not this all very hard on the innocent?

The answer to this question must be: That in this world we are not individuals who can escape all the consequences of membership in a human community. We benefit by the virtues and wisdom of our community and also we suffer for its vices and its folly. It is this social unity in human history between successive generations and between all the individuals of a single generation which permits social progress, and also admits of social suffering. But when we study human history, we observe that the advantages of this social unity are greater than the disadvantages.

We ought to add that Canon Green does not answer the question in this way; but it is on lines of the answer given by that great moral philosopher, Bishop Joseph Butler.

The second question is this :

(ii.) Since God must have known what use man would make of free-will, would it not have been better not to have given him free-will?

As God must be supposed to have known what use man would make of his free-will, and yet endowed him with free-will, we may wisely assume, in view of our limited knowledge, that God's decision, rather than a human criticism of that decision, is to be trusted. The modern engineer finds his supreme satisfaction in the creation of machines. God's creative genius would seem only to find supreme satisfaction in the progressive creation of beings able to enjoy fellowship with Himself. Beings capable of such fellowship must not only be rational, moral and spiritual, but also free.

A Theological Jubilee.

The *Expository Times*, founded in 1889 by Dr. James Hastings of Bible Dictionary fame, celebrates its Jubilee in its October number. Truly worthy, if somewhat pedestrian, has been the pilgrimage of this theological journal. Its aim has been, not to promulgate daring hypotheses in the spheres of Biblical and theological studies, but to promote, on solid lines, the education of its readers. Its Jubilee number is worthy both of its past and of its ideals. Its dominant note is the progress of theology during the last fifty years : the outstanding contributions in this number are, in our judgment, those of the Bishop of Truro, Dr. Garvie and Dr. J. H. Morrison.

Dr. Hunkin deals with the theological needs of the Church to-day. These are consolidation of our gains in the fields of research; the simplification of our popular teaching and the methods of its practical application. He opens with a quotation from a letter from that much misrepresented man, Benjamin Jowett :

> 'I wonder what will be the religion of the next generation. Certainly it has very rapidly disappeared in this. But I sometimes hope that we are near the end both of Rationalism and Ritualism and are beginning to understand that they are both exhausted. There seems to follow the absurdity that there must be a new religion ; not exactly so, but people must believe more strongly in a few truths which we all acknowledge, and they must apply them more vigorously to practical life.'

The Bishop's article follows the line which the Master of Balliol lays down. He remarks in his frank common-sensed way:

> 'We have learned to be critical. We cannot make ourselves believe without sufficient evidence, and we realize that it would be wrong to try.'

Nevertheless, the great affirmations of the Christian Faith are not only credible but needful for human welfare. In view of this Dr. Hunkin insists that it is the duty of Christian leaders

> 'to try to bring home to people in general the reasonableness and indeed the obligation of active—and let it be added critical—membership of one of the Christian societies. Now is surely a time to make a fresh appeal to all men and women of good will to identify themselves with Christianity presented in its true progressive comprehensiveness.'

This identification, as Dr. Hort affirmed, must be both rational and practical:

> 'Truth cannot be said to prevail where it is assented to on irrelevant or insufficient grounds: and the surest way to evoke its power is to encourage the strenuous confronting of it with personal life and knowledge.'

Our Church has lagged behind its greatest teachers. This is natural enough, but it is now high time that it awaked out of sleep. Dr. Hunkin concludes his fine appeal with another citation from Jowett:

> 'The times call for a new type of enthusiasm—clean and clear, and altogether distinct from murky and turgid fanaticism: enthusiasm for reasonableness and balance. "Enthusiasm," said Benjamin Jowett in a sermon in Westminster Abbey on 2nd July, 1876, "is a gift of God, not to be repressed, but to be dissected and purged of its lighter and weaker elements. Even the folly of the enthusiast is generally wiser that the wisdom of the cynic."'

Dr. Garvie's article, 'Fifty Years' Progress in Theology,' covers familiar ground, but in view of the retrogressions and aberrations of less experienced theologians deserves attention from those of the younger generation. Dealing with the urgent need for a modern Christology, Dr. Garvie writes:

> 'Whatever be the precise form of such a Christology, it cannot be content with the categories of the creeds, Nicaean or Chalcedonian, although it may work within their limits, very God, real man, one person. The categories of the creeds are derived from Greek philosophy—*static substance*. The categories for our own thought are *dynamic personality*.'

He adds:

> 'It is no injustice to the older theology to say that it was not exclusively or distinctively Christian.'

This is true of much of our contemporary theology. The further Christianization of Christian theology is one of the Church's

great tasks to-day. We cannot transcend the religion of Jesus, but the theology of the Church stands in need of continuous development and re-interpretation by Christian teachers.

Dr. Morrison's article, 'Some Changes in the Scientific Mind,' traverses equally familiar ground. He acknowledges how much we owed to the scientists when they kept strictly to science, but points out the grievous harm which some of them have done when, with inexcusable daring, they claimed to be philosophers and to interpret the whole of the Universe in terms of truth discovered in their particular department. Here, in many cases, they have been guilty of the fallacy of false analogy. Hence they mechanized the Universe and 'left no room for the emergence of the new' and 'for the occurrence of the unprecedented.' This cocksure temper of mind, as Dr. Morrison points out, is steadily yielding to the true humility of our greatest scientists :

> 'Twentieth-century science holds as firmly as ever by faith in the rationality of the universe without which no science could begin to build. But the scientist of to-day has a far deeper sense than his predecessors had of the mystery of things and of the limitations of his own knowledge, so that he is much less apt to imagine that his view of Nature is true and adequate.
>
> This more modest attitude of the scientific mind towards its own findings and formulations has been brought about in large measure by the revolutionary changes which have taken place in recent years in various departments of science. These changes have gone very deep, overturning foundations which were once taken to be as firm as the everlasting hills.'

The *Expository Times* in its Jubilee number, edited by the daughter and the son of Dr. James Hastings, is true to the Christian educational tradition of its great founder.

A New Effort towards Christian Unity.

The scandal of our unhappy divisions is less than it used to be. British Christians are still divided into numerous sects and denominations maintaining conflicting ecclesiastical systems and religious policies, but such intercourse as they have with each other to-day is for the most part characterized by a spirit of tolerance and good manners.

This is a very considerable advance towards the goals of inter-communion and reunion. Unfortunately, however, it has so far failed to remedy the distressingly feeble impact of the

divided Churches on the political policies of mankind. It is realized that, until Christian unity is secured, that influence on politics which the Christian Church ought to exercise cannot be achieved. This fact has come home to a small group of Christian workers in Surrey who have, as a consequence, sought publicity for a new endeavour to secure what thousands of Christian men have been trying to secure for years past and have so far failed to achieve. This latest effort, in view of the situation created by the war, deserves not only sympathy, but success. We reproduce their appeal *verbatim* :

A. *Letter to the Rev. C. L. Wilson, B.A., B.D., Minister, Caterham Congregational Church, Surrey, from the Rev. G. Holland, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Caterham. 11th September, 1939.*

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I wish to tell you that, as an ordained Deacon and Priest in the Church of England, I fully recognize the full validity of your Holy Orders in the Congregational Church.

My intimate contact with you and your Church during the evacuation through Caterham of the schoolchildren, mothers and babies, and expectant mothers, has finally decided for me what has been a growing conviction over a long period; namely, that the essential Christian Church feeds the hungry and the thirsty, shelters the stranger, clothes the naked, comforts the sick and visits the prisoners; and that means that the essential Church completely starts from a personal fellowship inspired by allegiance to Jesus Christ. I have long said to myself that creed, doctrine and dogma, while being a necessary intellectual equipment to any Church, are not so vital as that from which they spring. Meanwhile, I have more and more realised that though those intellectual things may be fool-proof as the inevitable background of stated faith, they are themselves no guarantee whatever of the presence in this place or that of the personal fellowship inspired by allegiance to Jesus Christ.

In acknowledging the full validity of your Holy Orders, I, for my part, am only giving what cannot be denied. And what I am doing in this letter implies that the union of Christendom lies open before the whole Church if the facts of the fellowship are recognised as being the religiously true starting place of Christian life.

As you know, I have striven within my limited capacity as curate to work for the union or unity of the Christian Church. All those holding the highest offices in the Church of England, from whom I have successively asked for a lead in this direction, have replied in one way or another that the thing was not yet possible or practicable. Let me say that not only our earnest Prime Minister (as he said truly for himself), but also every serious Christian, ought to be the most disappointed man now that the breakdown of international politics in Europe is a fact. Time and again I have pointed out that all over Europe — in our own country of England and on the mainland — are thousands of Christian Churches with their worshipping communities round them; yet there is no impact of Christian opinion upon the welfare of Europe.

The indictment is glaring. When those communities are united upon the essential pre-requisites of Christ's Church their influence in old Europe will be real and incalculable. It is with such views ahead that I, for one, will do all I can to establish the solid Christian foundation for local and international politics in this our world, which is a remarkable little globe revolving in space. There must be room for all. The alternative will only be the piling up again of colossal armaments. Meanwhile, then, and now particularly at the beginning of this war whose dimensions in time and area cannot be foreseen, I declare that steps towards a union of the Christian Churches is for Christians paramount.

I recall the resolutions adopted in May, 1938, by the (inter-denominational) Christian Organisations Committee of the League of Nations Union. One of the resolutions was: 'The Churches must insist that loyalty to the nation must be of such a character that it promotes the greater loyalty to the world of nations.' My repeated comment on that, publicly and in conference, has been that we clergy cannot justly subscribe to it until we resolve that loyalty to a Church or 'branch' must be such that it promotes the greater loyalty to the Kingdom of God. My challenging question, therefore, is: Which is the more important to the present-day Church, its articles of belief or the quality of its life? I have answered in favour of the latter. The Christian Church as a whole in the face of world crises in the recent years has been on the defensive, declaring that humanity's calamities are due to our contravening the will of God; a terribly poor, negative outlook, forgetting that ministers are commissioned to preach a positive, dynamic gospel, and that we Christians are all meant to be witnesses to it.

And now, in this situation which is extremely grave for the Church of Christ so long as we cling to the old water-tight sectarian paths, there has already been issued in *Partners*, this year's 'Unified Missionary Statement,' an unequivocal challenge to Christian unity, a clarion call to old Europe in these days of wondering and widespread despair at the condition of our present world. The one thing that Christians should be demanding for themselves is the one thing that Europe needs—community of purpose among people and nations, and identity of interest springing from a single faith. As 'Partners' argues, as Paul the great statesman of the Church argued, the Churches are 'many members, yet but one body.' The clarion declaration from overseas is that the Church cannot in fact claim to be world-wide or to meet the needs of world affairs so long as the 'Mother Churches' remain divided. In other words, without a definite step taken towards Christian union, it is no use trying to vocalize and mobilize Christian opinion by which, if our Gospel is a serious challenge, the quality and shape of world politics shall be made sure and free in negotiation, co-operation and joyful identity of purpose.

I hardly need add that what I am doing in this letter is on my own initiative and responsibility.

Yours sincerely,

G. HOLLAND.

B. *Letter to the Editor, 'Caterham and Purley Weekly Press,' from A. C. Austin, Esq., member of the National Labour Organization. 29th September, 1939.*

SIR,

I noticed in the columns of your issue of Friday, September 22nd, the copy of a letter from the Rev. G. Holland, a curate of St. John's,

Caterham, to the Rev. C. L. Wilson, Caterham Congregational Minister. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that I am by no means alone in considering the contents of this letter to be of supreme importance.

The present struggle in Europe is not primarily a struggle between England, France and Poland on the one hand, and Germany on the other: it is not even primarily a struggle between the democracies and the totalitarian Nazi government. As the Bishop of London has said, it is the same struggle (only more so) as that of 1914-18—a fight to the finish between the spirit of Christ and that of anti-Christ.

The Power which has committed acts of unspeakable savagery upon Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Lithuania and Poland, now joins hands with the Power which, working all the time in the dark places of the earth, and employing the ugliest of those methods which civilization has renounced as barbarous, strives ceaselessly for world revolution.

A supremely evil and sinister spectre has been launched upon the world, and it is to defeat this terror that liberty-loving peoples have taken up arms. Of the outcome of this war there can be no possible doubt. What is doubtful is the outcome of the peace which will follow it. And here comes the real significance of the Rev. G. Holland's remarkable letter. 'All over Europe,' he says, 'are thousands of Christian churches with their worshipping communities round them; yet there is no impact of Christian opinion upon the welfare of Europe.'

What a crushing commentary upon the use to which we have put the only weapon capable of warding off any and all attacks on World Peace by the powers of evil! Speaking as a close surveyor of the political scene, I harbour the gravest doubts as to whether statesmanship unaided can prevent further breakdowns in international relationships in the future. Even the utmost efforts of Mr. Neville Chamberlain, Lord Halifax, Monsieur Daladier, Signor Mussolini, President Roosevelt, and many others, could not avail in the present instance.

Statesmanship must receive active help from the Christian Church. It is not enough for responsible prelates to declare that 'Humanity's calamities are due to our contravening the will of God.' Inter-denominational bickering and squabbling must cease. A way must be found to unite all creeds, sects and denominations in the cause of civilization, which must be God's cause.

When we contemplate the dynamic power for good which would be generated by a real and binding unity within the Church, achieved by a mutual recognition of the fundamental things of our religion, we can begin to envisage a world order unharassed by recurring crises, by tiresome and dangerous ideologies, by poverty and bitterness, in which it may be possible for all men to live a full and contented life.

The Rev. G. Holland's letter is a challenge to all practical Christians. It wastes no time in recrimination, it is full of hope and faith in the future. Let us pray that something of its spirit will be remembered when the days of Peace are with us once more.

Yours, etc.,

ANTONY C. AUSTIN.

C. *An Announcement.*

We are speaking to those who agree that this subject we have raised must be pursued.

(1) *Our Platform* is Christian Unity. This will demand co-operation in worship and in spiritual work between the Christian Churches.

(2) *Our Policy* is, as that great lover of Peace, John Bright, said of war when it broke out in his time, to prosecute the war to its finish. We are fighting in the name of mutual freedom to be enjoyed by the peoples of the world, and towards establishing international political responsibility guaranteed by sanctions.

September 1st is, for England and France, the date when sanctions were employed in Europe by the adherents of political freedom.

(3) *Our Programme* is the Christian Religion in politics. This means bringing the impact of Christian belief in fact upon the welfare of Europe and the world.

There are two undefined chief movements at work in the world. (We in this pamphlet are declaring no new thing; we shall reap, indeed, where we have not sown.) First, the Churches, most notably in South India, are striving toward the union of Christendom. Second, the majority of everyday Christian people are earnest to get beyond the limits of their own denominations.

The welfare of people has broken down on the political side and on the religious side. We respectively represent religion and politics. On the political side, we emphasize that statesmanship unaided — of the highest quality, through Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Halifax, and the League of Nations, without mentioning the spokesmen of the United States and France — is unable to prevent world breakdown in international relationships. On the religious side, no 'branch' of the Church by itself, or without active co-operation in fact with other branches, can claim to offer the benefits of the 'Catholic' or 'Universal' Church of Jesus Christ.

On their side, politicians must be fully aware of their fundamental handicap. And parents of families, on their side equally, are pre-eminently concerned at the query of their young people, who ask 'Is Anglicanism—or Roman Catholicism—or Congregationalism—is any one of these enough?'

The decisive contribution to world affairs must come from a single Christian Church, from peoples renewed in faith, declaring a community of purpose in the name of Jesus Christ.

Our goal, then, is the union of Christians within our country and between the countries first of Europe, then of the world; and the impact of that union upon the welfare of Europe and the world.

We also remember that the music and literature that has come from all countries of Europe serve to lift up the human intellect where it can see the things that matter for men and women, things which are above selfish interests.

We stand on the threshold of a new world. The world of to-morrow must be one in which force shall not be the last resort for the settling of disputes. We all want such a world. Because of the Church of Jesus Christ, we have in our reach the opportunity now to ensure such a world in which we can live without appalling fear—as the Poles have lived—but with new inspiration and consequent new activity in national and international politics.

A beginning must be made now, in this country. We, through the medium of this pamphlet, are determined to set in motion a movement which will gather strength from members of all 'sides,' denominations, 'parties,' and sects—that is to say, from all Christians.

GEOFFREY HOLLAND,
ANTONY C. AUSTIN.

CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE AND SPECULATIVE DOCTRINAL EXPRESSION

By Rev. H. Bulcock, M.A., B.D., President of the Union of Modern Free Churchmen.

'THE abundance of the strange speculations with regard to Christ,' said Phillip Brooks, 'has shown me how He has drawn the hearts of men and compelled them to think about Him and to follow Him in such poor blind ways as they are able.' Such an attitude towards those doctrines of the Church which for one reason or another fail to appeal to the modern mind as literal expressions of the truth, finds in them another kind of value. They are not to be discarded as absurd and worthless. Their real significance lies in their witness to the eternal moral and spiritual appeal of Jesus of Nazareth to the minds and consciences of men. We are thrown back on the task of discriminating between the facts of spiritual experience and the 'thought-forms' of the first century in which they found expression.

'What we see in Church History,' claims Jonathan Brierley, 'is the Divine element of Christianity continually allying itself as by a process of chemical attraction with the different intellectual ideas of the varying races and ages through which its stream flowed. The soul of the gospel was clothed in a congeries of apocalyptic ideas which we could not enter into if we tried our hardest. Later we have this same essence encountering on its intellectual side the world of Greek philosophy and forming a new amalgam the result of which appears in the great Conciliar Creeds. It is one of the strangest things to find people looking to these creeds as the very palladium of Christianity when as a matter of fact their form and a good deal of their substance is not Christianity at all,' but Greek philosophy. The following study of Christological values is meant to illustrate the above principles.

I.

The Evolution of the Idea of Salvation.

The primary concern of Christianity was not originally the Incarnation (which in itself is a matter of metaphysical interest),

but human Salvation (in which Incarnation might in principle be involved). Salvation was indeed conceived in various senses. Sometimes it signified political emancipation; it implied the establishment of a Messianic Kingdom; the Saviour should be the one who should restore the Kingdom to Israel, either as a human Messiah or a supernatural Son of Man from heaven (as in the Similitudes of Enoch). The nature of the first preaching of Jesus is indicated by the verse, 'The time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the gospel' (*Mk.* i, v. 15). Moral repentance was the necessary preliminary to the coming of the Kingdom, as the Old Testament prophets had continually taught. This was the broad conception of Salvation which governed the first period of New Testament thought. In its apocalyptic form it persisted through the apostolic stage, even when other ideas of salvation were stressed along with it.

But there was another idea of Salvation, which however associated with the political deliverance, was largely distinct from it. This was Salvation from sin. The explanation of the name Jesus was found at an early date as signifying that this was He who should save His people from their sins (*Mat.* i, v. 21). There is no evidence that at the first this salvation indicated anything in the nature of a propitiatory sacrifice. The preaching even of St. John the Baptist is described as the preaching of the baptism of repentance 'unto the remission of sins' (*Mk.* i, v. 4). This was the simple conception of the eighth century prophets, that genuine repentance would be followed by forgiveness. In his dealings with men Jesus brought about changes of heart by friendliness, kindness and an unconquerable trust in the possibility of good in human personality. He fraternized with publicans and sinners and justified His action by saying that He, the Son of Man, was come to seek and save that which was lost. The parable of the Prodigal suggested that there was no need of propitiation after genuine repentance. The grudging elder brother needed an intercessor to persuade him to forgive; not so the father!

But another tradition was in the field. Leviticism had inherited ideas from primitive animistic magic in which sin was regarded not as wrong mental attitude but akin to physical defile-

ment and needing some ritual treatment apart from a change of mind. 'Propitiation' too had to be made either to evil spirits or to God. Hence the scapegoat bearing the people's sins, had to be turned into the wilderness as an offering to Azazel; or God was conceived as demanding the precious life-blood of Temple sacrifices. In the Maccabean period the sufferings of the righteous and the blood of martyrs became regarded as a propitiatory substitute (II *Mac.* vii, v. 38; IV *Mac.* vi, v. 29). Most significant for Christian theology was the description of the Suffering Servant of *Isaiah* liii, as 'an offering for sin' or a 'guilt offering' (v. 10). In the light of this tradition one reads the gospel saying, Verily, the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many (*Mk.* x, v. 45). This isolated reference to propitiation on the lips of Jesus may be only figurative of the uplifting influence for the world, of the sacrificial suffering and martyrdom of the Son of Man.

II.

The passage in *Isaiah* liii attracted the attention of the early Church for obvious reasons. It seemed to throw light on the problem of the sufferings and ignominious death of Jesus. At first it would possibly be noted only as a subtle 'identification mark' to prove the predicted Messiahship of Jesus; but when speculation continued to work on the problem of faith, further significance would be sought in the passage. Christ was in some way through His sufferings and death 'an offering for sin.' Leviticism must be brought in again, but stated in some higher form.

The most detailed and comprehensive scheme of salvation is set forth in the Pauline Epistles. Paul's speculations owed much to the general thought of his day. Even the Judaism in which he had been trained had for some centuries felt the influence of Persian and Hellenistic ideas. In the light of certain suggestions from post-Biblical Judaism, Paul on the basis of his profoundly personal experience of Jesus as the Christ who had saved him from the power and guilt of sin conceived a comprehensive scheme of soteriological speculation. The sin of the

'first Adam' had involved the race in a bondage to evil; into such an imprisoned world came Jesus, a heavenly being yet humanly born of a woman, and so humanly disguised that He was unrecognized by the world rulers of darkness; otherwise these spirit-powers would not have prompted men to crucify the Lord of Glory (I *Co.* ii, v. 8). Jesus however was put to death as a man. More than man He was raised by God from the dead. By this cosmic transaction the evil powers were overcome and their rule broken. Jesus had won a personal triumph over death and over all the associated evil powers of which death was a symbol. But how should others share this triumph? The answer was by some means of faith or sacrament uniting the soul with this Lord who had died and risen again.

It is interesting to note a modification in this scheme found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. This writer also taught that Jesus became 'a sharer in flesh and blood . . . that through death He might bring to nought him that had the power (*i.e.* the control) of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage' (ii, vv. 14, 15). Yet, says Prof. Peake (Century Bible, *Hebrews* p. 32), 'whilst with Paul the Resurrection is as important in Christ's work as the death, in *Hebrews* it has no theological importance at all . . . With Paul everything is included in union with the crucified and risen Lord and participation in His experiences. This is the very heart of the Pauline theology, but not a trace of it is found in *Hebrews*.'

III.

The Evolution of the Christological Idea.

All these schemes of salvation implied an exceptional view of the nature of Christ. Doctrines of Soteriology involve doctrines of Incarnation. How may we conceive the process whereby the Preacher of Galilee became regarded as the central factor in this cosmic act of the saving grace of God?

The greatest Jewish conception of the first century was that of the Messiah. The term had various contents, from that of a nationalistic Mahdi to that of an apocalyptic heavenly Man.

Despite the arguments of Wrede it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that Jesus Himself made some kind of Messianic claim. The most intelligible explanation of this claim comes from an approach to it through the Master's teaching of the Kingdom of God as an ethical commonwealth to be established, consisting of men and women of goodwill who should love God with heart and mind and soul and strength and their neighbours as themselves. Tradition ran that the Messianic Kingdom should be established by the Messiah. Such a spiritual commonwealth must be established by a corresponding spiritual Messiah, and Jesus as the recognized leader of this movement naturally fell into the place of the Messiah, and the Master realized the charge as a vital commission from God. Its acceptance by Himself, who was not a military leader but a prophet of righteousness and a preacher of a gospel on the lines of the Hebrew prophets, especially the second Isaiah, was indeed an indication of the nature of the Messianic Kingdom as He had come to conceive it.

This conception of the Kingdom of God as a religio-ethical commonwealth to be established through a nucleus of responsive men may in some points seem inconsistent with the apocalyptic creation of the new order after a preliminary and rather superficial repentance on the part of mankind. But in considering the relation of the two conceptions as far as they are diverse, we believe we must give the primacy in Jesus' own thought to the ethical and spiritual message and regard the apocalyptic features as largely contemporary thought-forms in which it was quite naturally expressed. To quote again from Brierley's essay on Spiritual Amalgams, 'Jesus, so far from being independent of His time and people, was full of the spirit of both. His whole thought and language were coloured by the Messianic and apocalyptic Judaism in which He had been brought up.'

But it is more than doubtful if all the apocalyptic language attributed to Jesus was really His. The apocalyptic element was enlarged in very early days and the Messiahship of Jesus was carried beyond that of the Divinely qualified Head of a new ethical commonwealth to include that of an apocalyptic Judge and potent Vice-regent of God descending in Parousial glory

from the skies. Our earliest New Testament writings, the Thessalonian Epistles, are full of the expectation which is still more fully described in I *Co.* xv, vv. 23-28.

It is possible that this apocalyptic development in regard to the person of Christ was largely due to the double significance of the term Son of Man; (*a*) as a collective name for the saints of God who, though suffering, persecuted and slain, should arise and possess the everlasting Kingdom; and (*b*) as the supernatural figure of the Similitudes of Enoch who should judge the quick and the dead, overthrow his enemies and establish his eternal dominion. Jesus identified Himself with the collective Son of Man, though not of course exclusively; but the early Church, as is implied by all the Evangelists, came to regard Him as *the* Son of Man, not only individual and personal, but identified with the Son of Man of parousial expectation — a conception which we do not feel convinced that Jesus claimed for Himself.

When the Christian faith was carried into Hellenistic circles at large and among Gentiles who found little meaning in the Jewish Messianic tradition, but were familiar with the agency among men of secondary deities, 'lords many,' a further momentous development seems intelligible. The apocalyptic Son of Man became translated into the corresponding Hellenistic category, although with fundamental ethical differences from other 'gods' and 'lords.' The seeds of Arianism were sown. Jesus became the object of worship and was endowed with functions of a saving communion realized through 'gnostic' faith and sacraments of a type alien to those of the more primitive Christianity.

It seems at first sight astounding that such a development could take place in a Christian Church inheriting the strong tradition of Jewish monotheism. But it cannot be too much emphasized that the Hellenistic world at large had already firmly established the conception of a Supreme God so distributing Himself in a series of secondary deities that they were at the same time different from Himself yet identical with Him. They were 'with God' and yet 'were God' as is said of the 'Word' (Logos) in *Jn.* i, v. 3. Whether the idea can be logically justified

is another matter. It was as if a man's will or energy or wisdom, strictly an aspect of his whole undivided being and personality, should be abstracted from the rest and become regarded as a separate being, a manikin standing alongside the man and acting as his agent. It seems like a confusion of aspects and entities, of abstractions of thinking and real divisions of essence.

Be that as it may, men appeared capable of thinking in such a way of these Emanated Deities. The aspect of God as wise became a Wisdom, standing alongside God as His fellow-worker in creation, as in the Wisdom Literature of the Jewish Apocrypha and again in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel with its Logos or Word, a divine agent creating the world. Similarly the Philonic Absolute 'emanates' the Logos, fashioning the species and acting as mediator between creation and the Supreme God, unapproachable in might and holiness. The Hermetic Father 'emanates' his Demiurgus-Nous and his Logos, who are entrusted with different phases of creative work. The Gnostic God 'emanates' various powers through whose evil or clumsy activity a world comes into being, on the whole an evil world yet containing a spark of goodness derived from an ultimate divine origin.

So Jesus of Nazareth, at first Prophet of repentance and righteousness, next ethical Messiah, then the Son of Man coming in parousial glory, received Hellenistic translation into a derivative deity of a well-defined type. He is the Creator of the world, the light that lighteth every man, the image of the Father, the first-born Son, the one who can be 'with God' and at the same time be God Himself, in the category of Emanations.

But such exalted identification did not arise in order to satisfy a mere intellectual and metaphysical interest. Such a deity becomes a Saviour God, and can function in a cosmic redemption such as Paul conceives. Only a non-human being disguised as man can break the power of death, and with it the domination of the spirit-world rulers of darkness. This is the answer to the question, *Cur Deus Homo*? Only the supernatural High Priest too can offer the cosmic sacrifice of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Only one from the other world can bring the saving 'gnosis'; only a supernatural being can impart himself through the sacramental rites.

IV.

A 'Regress' to First Principles of Christian Worth.

It seems a wrong task of apologetic to attempt to justify all these first-century thought-forms as scientific or philosophic still less to insist that they are essentials of Christian faith and discipleship. But it would be equally wrong to dismiss them as without meaning and value. They surely testify to certain facts of spiritual experience and find their explanation and interpretation in these. The intellectual study of developing Christology and Soteriology which we have sought to trace from step to step is only one side of the case. Christian values do not stand or fall by the intellectual and logical justification of an argumentative process. There must be a 'regress' to the first principles of Christian worth. There must be a recognition of the symbolic element in these later forms of doctrinal expression. The questions must be asked—why did men weave these speculations round this particular figure, what was the significance of associating salvation from one's lower self with Him? Why were men willing to give Jesus the greatest names known to them, apocalyptic Messiah, the Logos, the Heavenly High Priest? Why did men connect their largest hopes with His coming again to earth? Why did they accept Him as the Word made flesh? What grace and truth were His to make them feel that those who had seen Him had seen the Father? Why did they associate this Jesus of Nazareth with their experience of an inward divine life and power? What made Paul speak of the Christ that dwelt in him?

When we make this 'regress' to the origins of doctrinal speculation, we may have a basis for a convincing re-statement of faith acknowledging a centrality of Christ. Its differences from the older conceptions will not lie in real spiritual values, but largely in its setting in another philosophical scheme of the universe. The older thought conceived a universe of two compartments, in the one of which God, truth, grace, power were to be found; the other of which was largely foreign to Him, so that if any revelation, action or grace of God came to it, it would be by an irruption, a breaking through from another

realm. Its agents would be abnormal and their actions miraculous. The concern of religion was to demonstrate abnormality and marvel, a revelation which would not come from human discovery, a messenger from heaven walking the earth in partial human guise, a cosmic work utterly different from the moral and spiritual processes, influences and laws of human life.

But our restatement will rest upon an immanental philosophy that the whole world has a spiritual significance; that normality of law is indicative of God; that the supernatural means not the unnatural but the natural transfigured in thought and sublimated in action and use by a spiritual principle; that the grace of God can be realized in common processes of everyday experience in every generation; that God works by ordered evolution which may have peak moments of expression but never a break of fundamental continuity, nor an irruption from a 'second compartment' in a dualistic universe one-half of which belongs to God, and the other not.

In a world thus conceived we can realize the significance of a Jesus who made so great an impression on His immediate followers and whose words still carry so great an appeal to the spiritual and ethical sense of mankind. We read the Spirit behind the universe where we are conscious of its highest expressions of 'value.' In Jesus Christ, full of grace and truth, we see the Father. The essential truth of Incarnation is to be sought in the spiritual grandeur realized in humanity at its highest. There is no merit in a uniqueness which means abnormality and isolation—indeed, this is the negation of the true Incarnationist principle—but there is profound significance in excellence within the general realm of the familiar. To that excellence all New Testament speculation about Jesus bears impressive witness, however unconvincing and unappealing some of its inherent content may be.

Again, Salvation must also be a reality in a world with a fundamental spiritual basis. Life must have been constituted from the beginning with the possibilities of recovery from its set-backs in evolution. There is a 'seeking and a saving love of God' in the very constitution of the universe. There must be an eternal evangel in the very framing of God's earth. And

surely that process is to be seen in forces of personality and laws of influence illustrated by Christ and Christ-like men throughout the ages. We may not be able to accept theories of cosmic ritual, propitiations of an angry deity or mysterious transactions with evil principalities and powers; but we do know that the spirit of Jesus has made life new to men; that men loving Him have kept His commandments and realized the truth which has made them free and that He, lifted up, will draw all men to Himself.

This approach to the values of Jesus makes no attempt to answer certain questions on which older religious thought laid stress. It interprets Jesus by metaphysics reached independently instead of basing its metaphysics of the Incarnation on the isolated fact of an abnormal Jesus. It attempts no statements of the relation of Jesus to the Father on lines other than those conceived for the whole race and God. It makes no claim for a cosmic transaction effected by Jesus in virtue of His exceptional heavenly nature or supernormal type of personality. It knows nothing of a theosophy of the skies. Nor does it feel that faith has need of such things. Some of the questions as to who Jesus the Christ was, which classical theology has claimed to answer, seem to us unanswerable and not vitally important to faith or discipleship. But is it not enough to find that the Master can 'open out the choked-up wells of human intuition' (Matthew Arnold), and that His spiritual personality has a quickening effect upon ours? Is it not sufficient to realize from our own experience that He 'came that men might have life and have it abundantly?' In His discipleship do we not discover life of a richer quality? Through such a life do we not realize communion with God? What more can we say? What more do we need to say?

COMPOSURE: OUR PRESENT NEED*

By Kenneth Henderson, M.A., B.Litt. (Oxon), Perth, West Australia.

TO-DAY'S most urgent working need is for that inner victory of the spirit which we call composure. There are now, it is true, many people who enjoy more calm than intelligent beings are entitled to. Some care nothing for the looming threats to the whole fabric of life so long as these threats do not noticeably interfere with the form of racehorses or the domestic round. This calm is either sheer mental deficiency or that mind disease which psychologists call infantilism — the complaint of those who find a dangerous world too hard to face with the realism of adults and so relapse into childishness.

But for the ordinary man and woman there can be no contracting out of the sufferings of the age. In the back, if not the front, of their minds there swings the pendulum of an unceasing suspense. They dread the ending of it. They must speculate daily on what Hitler may do, what Mussolini intends or on what Japan may decide, fearing that the answer may be war in the home. And especially if they be middle-aged the image of that danger moves them terribly with pictures of the fate of young men, the sufferings of women and children, and of what happens to human nature when there is only stark force. And they are bitterly angry at the threat of war as an intolerable interruption to all that makes life worth living. But the troubled spirit is not confined to middle age. The young have their own special agitations. It is difficult for older people to realize that a man or woman now aged 26 has never known a normal world. These were 16 when the great depression threatened and in many cases damaged their careers, and since the decline of depression there has been the overhanging cloud of war.

Therefore people of normal imagination with nerves frayed by terrific uncertainty often feel they are losing self-control.

*The writer of this article was a member of the Anzac Expeditionary Force in the Great War.—[Ed. M.C.]

They find themselves subject to gusts of anger and shouting defiances, or moved by spasms of dread, or shaken by a feeling of helpless pity, or aware that their own moral sensitiveness and generosity are fading out before the threat of violence. That is to say they are losing their spiritual integrity. Out of that feeling arises the longing spoken in the prayer of the psalmist: 'O set me upon the rock that is higher than I.'

Dynamic Calm.

This rock of composure is not a retreat, a private refuge from confusion and evil, an abnegation of the energies of will and intellect in face of a situation beyond human control. There can be no private refuge open to the decent individual, for today's philosophies of violence will follow the writer and take from him his pen; they will pursue the teacher and take away his pupils; they will shut up the thinker from his books and his audience. No, composure must be held in the heart of one's battle against the powers of darkness for the sake of one's fellow-men. Composure is the gathering together of one's feelings, thoughts and energies for the doing of that which reason and conscience reveal, in the circumstance, as the best that one can do. Composure must be sensitive to tragedy, pierced by compassion, awake to possibilities of action, but as the organizing of one's personality for what one ought to do, it is happiness and power in the centre of pain and anxiety.

A Religion of Crisis.

Christianity originated as a religion of crisis, and so it remains. The men who rallied after the Crucifixion were men who had just seen the destruction of brilliant hopes for a better world order. They had been confident of the sudden breaking forth of a civilization more glorious and wonderful than the world had ever seen. Centred round the person of the Messiah Jesus, they believed that this 'Rule of God' was about to overwhelm and replace the fierce religious nationalism of the Jew and the heavy insensitive hand of Rome. Then they saw the Messiah deserted, they watched Him in Gethsemane struggling for his own composure in the presence of defeat, they saw Him

arrested and exposed to a trial that was the vindictiveness of frightened men, then scourged, crowned with thorns, and crucified. Afterwards there surged up within them the explosion of a new life, and an assurance that made each a potential victor, knowing what he had to do. The historical forces against them were too hostile, hard and massive for them to meet unaided; the odds against them remained the same. But each could regard the personal sufferings that confronted him as a continuation in his own experience of the sufferings and the spiritual victory of Christ. Each felt convinced that with him were the Universe's fundamental energies — wisdom, love, righteousness, the beauty of holiness — or, in other words, the will of God.

What then to-day are we to do with this composure if by this way, or by any way, we can attain it? In the conversation of conscience with conscience there can be no dogmatism. But surely in the presence of embattled violence backed by a philosophy of violence that can kill not only body but soul, there is a case for believing that the best we can do for the moment is to use a restraining force that will hold back the powers of darkness from yet unconquered territory, until the powers of wisdom and generosity can exercise their benign influence. The special value of composure at this time, however, is that it is not a surrender to the enemy, a surrender made by becoming shrill, frightened and irritable. It is the attempt to bring health to the cure of certain deep-rooted diseases.

The Tasks of Composure.

Composure is the first qualification for diagnosing the roots of bitterness that are poisoning the lives of nations. It is justice of mind. Composure alone can face the almost unapproachable ideological problem — as to whether there are certain elements and ideas in what seems to us the perverted collective idealisms of Russia, Germany, Italy and Japan that are genuine moral challenges to our own democratic civilization. Ours is a civilization animated chiefly by the personal desire for material advantage, but it leaves room for finer things that the totalitarians have sacrificed. Has it anything to learn from these hostile forces that threaten it, bitterly wrong as they are in many ways?

Who has the intellectual calm, the untroubled insight to attempt an answer? What we cannot help knowing is that there must be ways whereby nations and individuals can live together in mutual help and peace in a world better, safer and richer than we have known. We of the democracies know that we have been given time by the sufferings of others. The man who possesses his own soul must influence his fellows to turn that time to best account, to make good what has been done amiss, to practise the courageous magnanimity which alone can deliver us from this 'body of death.'

Within his own community the man of composure has an urgent task. A sincere love of country requires him to preserve his steadiness of spirit in danger or calamity. 'The City of Destruction is within.' He must keep a clear head in times of public passion; he must preserve the foresight of generosity when those around him are giving way to bitterness; he must have courage and calmness for the sake of those who are yielding to fear; be clear in his convictions when doubt and confusion are abroad. And when the worst happens and we are plunged into war, then it is his task to keep alive hope for the future and a reconciling wisdom, that when the time comes he may be an influence for true peace. Only by men and women who have achieved spiritual self-control can we break the cycle of misunderstanding and bitterness.

Only moral and spiritual forces can give us the lasting result of reconciliation, however bitter may be the disciplinary expedients we are forced into on the way. And these forces must be carried forward by steadfast individuals. He alone can preserve his composure who can lift himself above the feeling that he is a helpless victim of tumultuous circumstance, and can become a creative force for good in the midst of evil. He can best preserve his composure who knows himself in the possession of a Power working beneath the storms of danger and passion, a Power which the storms cannot prevent from reaching him, a Power that released the life of Jesus from being overwhelmed by the cross.

SPIRIT-BEARING

By the Right Rev. J. W. Hunkin, D.D., M.C., O.B.E.,
Bishop of Truro.

THE May number of *The Modern Churchman* contained a very valuable essay by the Editor on 'The Spirit-Bearing Church.' It was reprinted, I am glad to say, in the United States of America by Dr. A. G. Cummins in the July number of *The Chronicle*.

The following paragraphs are offered as an appendix to Dr. Major's paper. They are concerned with the actual use of the word *pneumatophoros* in ecclesiastical writings. The new Lexicon of Patristic Greek is still far from completion, but Dr. Darwell Stone has very kindly furnished me with the materials which he has on the word.

In the Greek texts the word may be read as *pneumatophóros*, spirit-bearing, or *pneumatóphoros*, spirit-borne. The editors, with the exceptions mentioned below, print the former — *pneumatophóros*, spirit-bearing.

In the Septuagint the word occurs twice — in an unfavourable sense: Hosea 9, 7, 'the man *that hath the spirit* is mad'; Zephaniah 3, 4, 'her prophets are *light* and treacherous persons.'

In the New Testament the word does not occur at all.

In Hermas we find, 'prove, therefore, by his works and his life the man who saith that he is *pneumatophóros*' (*Mand.* 11, 16).

In Theophilus of Antioch (2, 9) Wolf prints *pneumatóphoros*, spirit-borne: 'But men of God borne by holy spirit and becoming prophets, being inspired and made wise by God, become God-taught, and holy, and righteous.'

Eusebius has: 'But the spirit-bearing prophet pathetically bewails the woes of the Jews as those of his own people' (*Demonst. Evang.* 6, 18, 6)—the reference being to the prophet Zechariah.

In Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, 23, Dr. Darwell Stone is inclined to read *pneumatóphoros*, spirit-borne: 'as clear and transparent bodies, if a ray of light fall upon them, both become

radiant themselves and also diffuse another splendour from themselves, so souls spirit-borne are both themselves illuminated by the spirit and also impart their grace to others.'

Two more examples may be quoted—from Cyril of Jerusalem: *Catechetical Lectures*, 2, 4: 'And this is not my teaching, but that of the spirit-bearing prophet Ezekiel.' And 16, 28: 'But as touching Elias who was taken up, and Elisseus, those spirit-bearing and wonder-working men, it is manifest, without our saying so, that they were full of the Holy Ghost.'

Epiphanius, Theodoret, and other writers use the word in precisely the same sense. It is applied to St. John the Baptist, St. Paul, the Evangelists, as well as to Old Testament prophets and others.

The interesting point to notice is that the word *pneumatophoros* seems never actually to be found as an epithet of the word *Church*. It is only applied to individuals. This fact is not without significance. Dr. Major quotes Archbishop William Temple as saying on one occasion, 'The Bishops are the organs of the Holy Ghost or they are nothing.' And Dr. Major adds, 'This is true also of the humblest member of the Christian Church.' The indwelling of the Spirit is to be looked for in the individual Christian souls which together form the Christian community.' The Spirit is not 'restricted in His operations to the use of ecclesiastical machinery.' The religion of the Spirit is what Bergson calls 'open religion,' religion which lays stress on direct personal contact with the creative Spirit, rather than on ritual and formulated creed. The Church is a Society of Spirit-bearing persons.

ENDURE

'Behold, we count them happy which endure.'—*St. James* v, 1.

GREAT causes often exact suffering from their adherents. Our great cause, Modernism, will sometimes exact suffering from us; it ought to; we must not mind; it is part of our call and a condition of our achievement. Hardly any great things seem to have been done without it. If you think, as I do, that there is no greater cause on earth to-day than the reviving and strengthening of the religion of England, then we must enter on our crusade ready to endure; we must expect suspicion, misrepresentation, repression from authority, loneliness and, worst of all, misunderstanding from those beautiful, simple Christian lives around us, even from the dear ones of our own home, to whom most reluctantly we may seem for the moment to be destructive, whereas, of course, really we are indelibly constructive. It is all worth while; and by the grace of God we can see it through.

I am going to bring before you several Christian leaders who endured for their own high purposes to the lasting benefit of the Church; bright and imperative examples to us.

1. First, *Wycliffe*. His famous title is 'The Morning Star of the Reformation.' More explicit is a miniature in the University Library of Prague: 'Wycliffe striking a spark, Huss kindling the coals, Luther brandishing the lighted torch.' Wycliffe may, I venture to think, be regarded as part Reformer, part (for those days) Modernist; these being two allied movements.

In 1374 he became Rector of Lutterworth, a typical English village in Leicestershire, within easy reach of Rugby, well worth a visit. His church is there, and you cross the famous brook or little river, the Swift, of which I shall say more in a moment. About the year 1380 he sent out his famous 'Poor Priests,' itinerant evangelists to preach 'God's Word.' In 1382 he completed and published his monumental work, the English Bible—the New Testament mainly his own rendering, the Old

* An address delivered in Chapel by the Rev. Hubert Handley, M.A., to the students of Ripon Hall.

Testament largely the production of others. The translation was from the Vulgate. Lechler, the eminent German biographer of Wycliffe, edited in English by Lorimer, affirms that 'Wycliffe was the first to conceive the great idea of a translation of the *whole* Bible.' His purpose, we might almost say his passion, was 'the Bible for the people.' Incidentally, the influence of Wycliffe's Bible on the English language is said to be comparable to the influence of Luther's Bible on the German.

We have not time even to glance at his classical reforms of doctrine, nor is it necessary; for our purpose he was just the first great example of the maligned and persecuted Reformer. 'Wycliffe's life,' says Lechler, 'in his latest years was always in danger.' After death (in 1384) he was thus insulted by a hostile chronicler:

> 'On the Feast of the Passion of St. Thomas of Canterbury, John Wycliffe—that instrument of the devil, that enemy of the Church, that author of confusion to the common people, that idol of heretics, that image of hypocrites, that originator of schism, that son of hatred, that corner of lies—being smitten by the horrible judgment of God, was struck with palsy, and continued to live in that condition until St. Silvester's Day, on which he breathed out his malicious spirit into the abodes of darkness.'

In 1415 the Council of Constance ordered Wycliffe's body to be exhumed and his books burned, and eight years later the body itself was 'burned to ashes and cast into the little river Swift.' 'Thus,' in the famous words of Thomas Fuller, 'the little river conveyed Wycliffe's remains into the Avon, Avon into the Severn, Severn into the narrow seas, they to the main ocean. And thus the ashes of Wycliffe are the emblem of his doctrine, which now is dispersed the world over.'

I will give one short specimen of Wycliffe's vigorous English style, taken from his *Select English Works*, compiled and edited by Thomas Arnold, second son of Dr. Arnold. Wycliffe is scourging the proud, worldly clergy:

> 'And as Judas was a thef and no membre of Crist, ne pert of holy Chirche, though he mynistride the ordre of bischopod, but was a devel of helle, as Crist seith in the gospel, so, if thes worldly clerkis schullen be dampned for their cursed synnes, as coveitise ypocrisie symonye and dispeir, as Judas was, thei ben fendis of hell and no Cristene men, ne membris of Crist, ne pert of holy Chirche.'

2. Second, *St. Francis*. Now let us take a Catholic turn on the long uphill road of Christian endurance. Francis of Assisi,

too, bore the strain manfully for a great idea and a great amelioration. Francis lived (1182-1226) more than a hundred years before Wycliffe, but for our purpose he here comes second. He shook and changed the sluggish moral consciousness of Christendom concerning *Poverty*. The Church, while quoting and professing the sublime precepts of Christ about the poor, had itself fallen to the level of the ordinary worldly estimate and condescension — the poor had been *inferior*. Francis determined that they should thenceforth in Christian standards be equal or even *superior*.

Some of you, perhaps many, have stood in the beautiful little town of Assisi on the hillside, overlooking for miles the spacious Umbrian plain. Here, at the age of 24, occurred Francis's conversion. Riding one day in the plain he met a leper. He had always hitherto been repelled by this pathetic, offensive sight; he used to turn his eyes away and, it is said, to hold his nostrils with his hand. Now he dismounted, gave the leper alms, kissed him, and received back the kiss of peace. Henceforward he was devoted to the leper cause. This may be said to be the beginning of the historic, world-wide Franciscan Movement. Its genius was the praise and illustration of Poverty. There are famous events and institutions recorded in Francis's life — the early preaching, establishing the Rule, founding the Order, foreign missions, preaching to the birds, the *stigmata*; all were, directly or indirectly, 'in praise of Poverty'; 'it is the foundation and guardian of every virtue and the most excellent and radiant way of coming into God's presence.'

Thus was Francis, in all history, one of the supreme friends and champions of the poor. He himself endured extreme poverty, together with ascetic practices, on their behalf. The famous French picture of the dying Francis on his litter in the countryside around Assisi, blessing his beloved town, represents the climax of his charity and sacrifice. Among his last words to the brethren were these: 'And I, Brother Francis, your little servant, inasmuch as I can, confirm unto you, within and without, this most holy blessing.'

3. *George Fox*, our next hero, was in outward circumstances as unlike Francis as could be, but was entirely like him in the inward vision and daring of the true reformer. The key of Fox's

message was the Light within, the Divine inward Light, without ritual or externals. His Journal, elaborating his doctrine, is one of the spiritual classics of the English language.

His date is 1624-1690. As a young shoemaker aged 19, he left all and walked the country preaching inwardness in religion. He narrates with great candour and humility his racking temptations for several years. 'Temptations grew more and more, and I was tempted almost to despair. . . . I was about twenty years of age when these exercises came upon me; and I continued in that condition for some years.' As a parish clergyman of long experience, I greatly respect Fox for his confidence in this matter; many a youth, perplexed and harassed by his own trials, has been encouraged on learning that he is not peculiar, not alone, but that great Christians have led the way and won the struggle before him. Aged 24, Fox received more and more of the Divine Light; 'The Lord commanded me to go abroad into the world, which was like a briery, thorny wilderness; and when I came with the word of life into the world, the world swelled and made a noise, like the great raging of the waves of the sea.'

Here are some representative notes from the Journal:

1. The interview with Cromwell: 'Now I see,' said Cromwell, 'there is a people risen and come up that I cannot win either with gifts, honours, offices, or places; but all other sects or people I can.'

2. The letter to King Charles II, beginning: 'Thou camest not into this nation by sword nor by victory of war, but by the power of the Lord. Now if thou live not in it, thou wilt not prosper.'

3. The proclamation to Derby: 'O Derby! the woe is against the crown of pride; against them that make a profession of religion in words, yet are high and lofty in mind, and live in oppression and envy. O Derby! your assemblies are odious and an abomination to the Lord: pride is set up, and bowed down to.'

4. Rebuke of a hypocrite: 'The Ranter, T. Bushell, told me he was come to bow down to the ground before me; and many other flattering words he spoke. I said unto him, "Repent, thou beast."'

5. On the other hand were the words of the Derby Jailer, Thomas Sharman, who at first had been harsh to Fox his prisoner but later was converted by the memory of Fox's conversation and wrote to him in touching and grateful terms: 'O happy George Fox! that first breathed the breath of life within the walls of my habitation!'

Fox left behind him, after his death, not any wide or prevailing institution, but an undying influence among all Christian churches, bodies, or societies — the influence of inwardness in religion and the influence of Peace. Carlyle went so far as to

write that 'Perhaps the most remarkable incident in Modern History is . . . George Fox's making to himself a suit of Leather.'

Fox suffered constantly for his principles. 'He went to gaol over and over again through a long course of years.' 'While I was at Mansfield-Woodhouse, the people fell upon me in a great rage, struck me down, and almost smothered me; I was cruelly beaten and bruised by them with their hands, Bibles, and sticks. . . . The rude people stoned me out of the town, for preaching the word of life to them.'

4. *Garibaldi* might, at first glance, seem to be a strange colleague among our list of Christian leaders in endurance; but, though far from being ecclesiastical, he belongs really, I believe, to our ranks of Christian heroes—'the rover of great spaces of land and sea, the fighter against desperate odds, the champion of the oppressed, the patriot, the humane and generous man.' 'He usually spoke of "God, the Father of all nations." He venerated the doctrine of Christ, because Christ came into the world to liberate the world from slavery.'

My brief, altogether inadequate lesson from him is found in G. M. Trevelyan's *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic*. Let us catch a glimpse of the struggle in the year 1849.

The Papal Government had been overthrown and the Pope had fled; the Roman Republic, founded in the main by Mazzini and Garibaldi, had been proclaimed; but French troops were sent for its destruction, their cannon fatally threatening the city. In the crisis Mazzini told the Assembly that there were three courses open to them: (1) surrender, which was scouted; (2) die fighting in the streets, which was unavailing; (3) exodus into the mountains with the Government and the army. The third course in the main Garibaldi approved, 'wherever we go, there will be Rome'; and he planned and carried out the adventure. Trevelyan calls it 'Garibaldi's desperate project.' On July 2, in extraordinarily romantic surroundings, the expedition took shape. The scene lies in the great piazza of St. Peter's, which 'seemed paved with human faces,' the crowd standing 'packed up to the very doors of the Vatican.' Suddenly appeared Garibaldi in his black feathers riding slowly through the throng, making for the Egyptian obelisk in the middle of the space. Here he halted and turned his horse, and gave a sign with his hand to stop the cheers. There was a dead calm in the square.

In that stillness after the tempest the sonorous, thrilling voice was heard almost to the outskirts of the multitude[1]:

> 'Fortune, who betrays us to-day, will smile on us to-morrow. I am going out of Rome. Let those who wish to continue the war against the stranger, come with me. I offer neither pay, nor quarters, nor provisions; I offer hunger, thirst, forced marches, battles and death. Let him who loves his country in his heart and not with his lips only, follow me.'

It was one of the speeches of history; not a hundred words, but of indescribable power. About 4,000 volunteers answered the call and marched out under Garibaldi, some twenty miles, to the Sabine hills. Though not immediately successful, they forged a noble link in the chain of national deliverance.

Our survey is ended. I do not for a moment pretend to summon you, my hearers, to the heroic heights of that last appeal of Garibaldi; I am not a hero and have no right to do it. But the several great men whom we have been considering summon us all, you and me alike, if we would serve Modernism, to two humbler tasks — tasks humbler, lads, yet blessed beyond all imagining — to *love* and to *suffer*.

[1] This description is abbreviated from Trevelyan.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE MORAL ROUTE TO RELIGION*

Professor De Burgh has now published his Gifford Lectures delivered in 1938, and he explains that their purpose is to make a contribution towards the need for a religious philosophy. He approaches the subject *via* the science of ethics, showing how religion is able to satisfy the claims of morality, and to answer questions which morality asks but cannot answer. There were critics of Presbyterian preachers who used to say that the sermons in 'Kirk' were no more than 'a dry clatter o' morality.' The object of the present work is to show that however much morality may 'clatter' about motives and maxims, it has an important relation of inference towards religion.

> 'Ethical experience points directly to that of religion for its fulfilment . . . and by enriching human nature with a new motive, it at once sanctions and transforms morality, by raising conduct to a higher plane.'

Two theories of moral conduct have continued to hold the field. These are, roughly speaking, the Greek view and the theory of Kant. They are action from a notion of duty and action with the idea of producing a good end.

A thing ought to be done either from a sense of duty or because it is

* *From Morality to Religion.* By W. G. De Burgh. (MacDonald and Evans. Unpriced.)

conducive to good. But what gives the command? In the case of duty it seems to be, as Kant held, the moral agent's rational self, and in the case of action inspired by the ideal of the 'good,' it appears that 'the good' must have its own obligation. Yet, as we know, neither of these two obligations will of themselves and invariably lead to right action. Moral experience of the inefficacy of ethical principles points us to religion, to action that amounts to 'an act of faith in the providential government of the universe.' If the world is ordered on principles that are in harmony with the moral law — if, in a word, a personal God is behind the ethical 'ought' — then the religious man gets done what is right because he acts from a command that is heard and obeyed in faith. Every man of religion, every saint is an example of that religious philosophy which accepts the ethical as part and parcel of the order of the world, and at the same time puts into effect the best ethical action through obedience to a personal Being who Himself gives the 'oughtness' to moral striving. Every shortcoming, by the same view, is not an ethical mistake merely, but a change of relationship towards this personal God; and to rectify the relationship constantly is the purpose of all forms of religious observance.

> 'It is clear that the new motive, the love of God, involves a transvaluation which is radical and all-pervasive. The religious man will still exhibit the ethical qualities of temperance, liberality, and justice; he will speak the truth, pay his debts, and discharge his obligations to family and state. But these virtues appear now in a new light as fruits of the Spirit, and breach of the moral law appears as sin . . . It is the consciousness of personal relationship to God that makes the difference.'

This distinction is in principle the same as that drawn by St. Thomas Aquinas between 'infused' and 'acquired' virtue. Certain virtues can be acquired by almost anyone as habits gained through practice in following the law of reason, *e.g.* prudence, justice, temperance, courage. On the other hand, virtues such as faith, hope, and love are 'infused' by divine grace, and have nothing to do with rational practice and repetition. They are 'formed in us by God without us,' *i.e.* 'without action on our part, but not without our consent.

If Christianity offers us the highest type of religious philosophy, why is it that it has been so pernicious in some of its manifestations? How are we to explain the *chronique scandaleuse* of ecclesiastical history? There is a catalogue of wars, persecutions, falsities, and facts of personal pride that seem to poison the spring of eternal life at its source. Professor De Burgh has some interesting observations on this matter. Even if the truth of these perversities be admitted, he believes that the value of the Christian religion remains unimpaired. In fact, it is from the standpoint of Christian morality that these very charges against organized Christianity are made. If the true faith and mission of Christianity were better known, defects due to a 'this-worldly' interpretation of it would be seen in their grotesque inadequacy. *Corruptio optimi pessima*: the higher the ideal the more

likely is performance to fall short of profession.

The reader will find in this volume lucidity of expression and well-chosen illustrations to assist the progress of the argument. We are inclined to value it all the more because it is a contribution from a philosopher at a time when much may be gained by a plea for our faith from a thinker who is not ecclesiastically-minded. In a period when many of the idols of the temple are passed by or being overturned there is ample opportunity for one who will speak in the market-place a message that has its test and truth in the heart of every man. Modern Churchmen will also read with interest the Professor's paper read at the Girton Conference this year dealing with a kindred subject to that which he has here discussed with so much clarity and good sense. J. R. McCallum.

POPES WITHOUT HALOES*

Mr. Joseph McCabe was once a Franciscan Friar, and has related his experiences in a volume entitled *Twelve Years in a Monastery*, from which the reader gathers that the conventual life is neither devout nor vicious, but tedious and unhealthy. Since his secession Mr. McCabe has produced a large number of secularist and anti-Roman works, of which his *History of the Popes** is the latest. He is well acquainted with the hagiographic methods of Roman Catholic ecclesiastical historians, and is mainly engaged in detecting their evasions, errors and misrepresentations, whether these be the result of prudery or professional reticence. In consequence the reader follows the scent of scandal through 500 large pages; Popes are either knaves or nonentities. Like the illustrious Gibbon, Mr. McCabe does not consider sex appeal beneath the dignity of history, and he draws freely on Lea's *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*. The result is a work which does not tend to inform or edify the theological student; but Orangemen, Kensitites and those who like their history spicy should put this book on their library lists.

The methods employed are those of the chronicler rather than of the historian. The papacy as an institution is scarcely considered; nor why Catholicism in the West became centralised when the government disintegrated, but in the East the government was central and the Church federal. Mr. McCabe has no interest in the Byzantine Church, but surely to compare the two types of Catholicism, papal and non-papal, would have helped to elicit the distinguishing characteristics of the papacy. Nor does the writer raise the question whether in the West, Catholicism would have been purer had there never been a Pope. If the records of the papal court are discreditable, was Catholicism outside Italy any better? Mr. McCabe has crowded his pages with facts arranged perspicuously, and it is difficult to see how he could have done more; but amid the lurid details the reader forgets that he is studying the growth of the most ancient and interesting of European monarchies, and tends to think that anarchy was the chief mark of papal rule. P. R. Smythe.

**A History of the Popes.* By Joseph McCabe. (Watts. 1939. 15/-.)

THE PHILOSOPHY OF COURAGE*

The Philosophy of Courage by Mr. Philip Leon sets out to give a rationale of the Oxford Group movement, of the process of life-changing and the obstacles to such change, but in point of fact it succeeds in giving an acutely introspective analysis of a process of conversion, such as can be found outside as well as inside the Groups. As such those who do not look with favour on the Groups will find its sincerity profitable.

Obviously Mr. Leon cannot live the *βιὸς ἀνεξέταστος* and will go farther in his analysis of both himself and the world; he has moved from the position of his last book *The Ethics of Power,* and his ideas will develop themselves farther upon the theological issues raised at the beginning of the book. He emphasises the idea of God as 'Power'—saying that the Church has made too little of this in her teaching. He uses the expression 'the Cross' not in the more usual sense of the hardships to be found in following the path of virtue, but in the sense of the death to sin and the rebirth to righteousness. He will therefore have nothing to do with an *ex opere operato* theory of salvation, for the Cross has to be incorporated in the life of each individual.

There is much interesting writing upon the tortuous processes whereby the twice born reach their second birth, and of their possible failure to do so. Particularly noteworthy are the remarks upon the perversion of religion, drawing attention to the fact that when the devil captures a Christian institution he does not as a rule change the labels. Fear is the root cause of all our troubles in life, and those of us who do not attain to the conquest of fear by the perfect love which exorcises it tend to capitalise our fears into manias and fanaticisms which are the motive forces of a large percentage of life's activities, and the cause of our personal, social and national disharmonies. Hence Mr. Leon calls 'unchanged politics' the 'Art of manipulating fears'—a penetrating phrase. There is an interesting analysis of the large-scale rationalisations made by society, which he calls 'the larger self'—*i.e.* the sum of the rationalisations and fanaticisms and manias of the individuals who make up society. These chapters are perhaps the best commentary upon what theologians call 'the world' and the manner in which we respond to it, that the reviewer has met with.

There are interesting criticisms of literary folk, of the vanity of artists, and of those who extol art as a religion.

> 'It took me a long time to discover that the Pharisees of our time were not among the religious people but among the free thinking, progressive, advanced, enlightened, and left-wing people, to whom I myself belonged. Very few of them have discovered this truth, just as few of the original Pharisees realised that they were the Pharisees in our sense of the word.'

Mr. Leon writes briefly about sex and purity, distinguishing the latter from that impurity which masquerades as purity.

* *The Philosophy of Courage.* By Philip Leon. (George Allen and Unwin. 1939. 6/-.)

On the subject of guidance the writer's utterances are in the main sane and fully critical—*o si sic omnes*. He makes the rather astounding statement, however, that 'nothing happens to me through God's power without my consent.' Perhaps this is true at certain levels of religious experience. As to the nature of guidance—this will show itself in the abandonment of *idées fixes* or the limited programmes of fanatics, who often achieve a great deal by the very narrowness of their vision, but from the wrong motives, and in the adoption of an enlightened opportunism.

In fine, this book takes us through most of the mental devices and self-deceptions known to psychologists, and most of them well known to Christians in the past as well as in the present. It is an interesting and stimulating book, and helpful more particularly in those parts where the writer is objectively analysing society rather than in those where he is subjectively analysing himself. It is valuable as the record of a spiritual pilgrimage of one who has no little degree of what Huxley calls 'awareness,' and who is reaching after what modernists will be glad to recognise as a Christianity of their own type, free from the fetters of intellectual dependence and from the shackles of secondhand experience.

J. D. Pearce-Higgins.

SOCIAL RELIGION IN AMERICA*

Professor Macintosh of Yale University is a Canadian citizen who was denied American citizenship by the United States Supreme Court because he would not promise to partake in *any* war which the Congress might declare. He maintained that his conscience was based on the will of God rather than on any political body. During the period he has been in the States, he has established himself as one of America's leading empirical theologians, and his books and influence have been widely noted. His previous books (*Theology as an Empirical Science, Reasonableness of Christianity, Religious Realism* and others) have been technical and philosophical. In this volume he turns to an examination of the scriptural basis for Social Religion, and then applies those principles to the problems which face society to-day.

It is a brilliant book, not only because of the conclusions reached, but because a wealth of critical scholarship and Christian conviction is combined with simplicity of expression. Furthermore, it is a turning away from the extremes of the eschatological and form criticism schools without denying the validity of their methods. Without being a professional New Testament critic, the author shows wide acquaintance with their techniques and makes many pertinent comments of his own.

Social religion is defined as

> 'the free acceptance of the true well-being of humanity as the will of God for man, and thus as an absolute moral, social and religious obligation' (p. 3).

* *Social Religion.* By Douglas Clyde Macintosh. (New York and London. Charles Scribner's Sons. xv + 336 pp. $3.00. 1938.)

> 'Whatever is right is the will of God. . . . We can thus know what the will of God is, since we can find out much about what is right and makes for individual and social well-being. God's will is the rational, social good. . . . In working towards the end set up by the will of God and by unselfish love for humanity, it is highly important that use be made of scientific knowledge, especially of social processes and relations, and that the further development of such social science be promoted' (pp. 129-130).

This is not a question of trying to 'modernize' Jesus. It is the attempt to get back from what the theologians and the Church have taught to the religion of Jesus Himself, to discover what He 'felt and thought and taught and lived and died for' (p. 5). The Kingdom is the Reign of God within the hearts of men, and it is both ethical and social. The gospel of Jesus brings good news, but not to the rich. The poor are not blessed now, because they may starve to death; nor are the meek blessed now, nor the hungry; but when the Kingdom comes things will be different. Jesus was aware that the Kingdom would provide a different environment as well as a different type of person. These two go hand in hand.

Jesus tried to get people to work for the coming of the Kingdom. His emphasis was primarily on man, until He learned that man could not do it, and then He turned more and more to the insistence that God's action would do it. But both emphases were parts of the truth that

> 'it is Christian and Christ-like to "pray as if everything depended upon God" and yet to work almost "as if everything depended upon man"' (p. 87).

There was a definite change of emphasis in Jesus' teaching as He began to realize that his good news and faith in mankind were not bringing the desired results. Prof. Macintosh is convinced that the eschatological and messianic elements in Jesus' thought were later developments. He began to conceive Himself as the 'suffering servant of the Lord,' and He looked for the coming of the Kingdom. He never was the extremist on these points that might be expected from the teachings of the early Church as reflected in the Gospels; but there was at least the beginning of such thought. It was this, perhaps, which helped to arouse the opposition, and, as His popularity waned, it was possible to bring about His death.

No legalism can ever unlock the doors of the Kingdom. Even the outer door can only be opened by that social *justice* which would find a place for the dispossessed and disinherited to whom Jesus intended the good news to be preached. The second key is that type of *love* which can open men's hearts to God. The third key is *faith*, something contagious enough to draw other men to the same faith.

> 'When those who claim to be followers of Christ make full use of these keys, the Church will be socialized and the Kingdom of God will come on earth. . . . Personal Christianity is an indispensable precondition of the realization of the good news foretold in the social

gospel, for it is vain to expect the will of God to be done socially when it is being flouted in the hearts and wills of the individuals concerned' (pp. 112, 113).

All of this and much more is necessary before we can understand the common social problems which face Christianity to-day. The second half of the book is a tract for these times, spoken mainly to Americans, to be sure, but full of truths which Christians the world over can neglect only at their peril. Dr. Macintosh gives us timely analyses of war, poverty, liberty, and the reformation of government—topics of grave concern in any land. Concerning war, he would like to see a reconstructed League of Nations, with the United States taking its place. From some such arrangement it would be possible to make new solutions to the most pressing problems facing the nations. If this could be done in sufficiently moral fashion, steps might be taken toward a world federation. Until this last step is taken, little can be done about disarmament, or sanctions, or anything else which can prevent war.

The chapter on poverty treats in some detail the attempts of President Roosevelt and the New Deal to make a readjustment among the rich and poor. But no solution will work without finding out how to combine a socializing of the economic order with an adequate safeguarding of liberty. This brings up the whole problem of freedom, and the author cites his own famous citizenship case (pp. 285-292) as an example of the actual tension between Christianity and the claims of the State. There are brief comments on Russia and Italy, and some details on conditions in Germany and the German Church. The final chapter deals with the problem of how Christians may organize to bring about political reforms, and practical suggestions are made which would have cogency in democratic countries. Particular references are made to the efforts of various parties in the United States, especially the American Labour Party, but the same principles would work in Britain.

The book deals primarily with social religion, and the treatment of the religion of Jesus is necessarily one-sided. But at the same time a feeling is persistent that the recent emphases on eschatology and personal religion will be changed by such studies as this. As a permanent contribution to Christian scholarship, Part I is invaluable. Part II is likely to seem dated in a few years, but at the same time it is an unusual example of how the principles of social religion may be applied in these troublous times. The book is written simply, but a wealth of scholarship has gone into the writing of it. The footnotes are ample and helpful, and there are two indices. Anyone interested in applying Christianity to society must have this book. And what real Christian is not?

RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER.

Church Divinity School of the Pacific,
Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

SHORT NOTICES

The Healing Cross. Herbert H. Farmer, D.D. (Nisbet & Co. Ltd. 1938. 6/-.)

These 'Further Studies in the Christian Interpretation of Life' have the charm of the simplicity of the Gospels. They seem to be the reflections of a mind which is so fully at one with the revealed teachings of Christ that it is able without apparent effort to translate them into the language of the present. Their appeal is to those who are themselves seeking to follow the way of the Cross. There is in them nothing new or startling, nor any striving after effect, but a restatement of the ideas contained in the Creed and the New Testament. The book holds the reader's attention because it is obviously the fruit of experience. It is a valuable addition to modern devotional literature.

Meditations on the Cross. Toyohiko Kagawa. Translated by Helen F. Toping and Marion R. Draper. (S.C.M. 2/-. 1936.)

Dr. Kagawa is, as the publishers say, 'one of the outstanding writers of Japan to-day in fiction, journalism and religion.' First published in 1936, this book belongs to the period just before the war. Two impressions come from reading it. One is of short incisive sentences of the simplest construction, carrying the writer's thought straight to the reader's mind. The other is his way of retelling the Gospel stories. Dr. Kagawa is 'involved in the social movement,' and interprets them accordingly. Much is admirable, so that one wishes he could be persuaded to write the Bible in modern speech. But his practice of adding motives to the story which may or may not have been there, and treating them as of equal authority with the original, will displease some. His comments on modern social movements are sound and pointed.

Worship and Drama. Rev. W. S. Scott, M.A., T.C.D. (Allen Lane. 1938. Not priced.)

This little book takes the reader into a department of liturgy generally neglected. Plenty of artists are trying to give us the best of Music, Design and Colour in our churches; but, unless the Liturgy for which they are the setting is itself rendered as a work of art, they form but a patchwork. The only kind of art which can handle a whole service of worship is that of the Drama. Mr. Scott, who was an actor before he became a priest, has done a valuable service by pointing this out, and has used his experience to elaborate it in detail. In the first part of the book he has analysed and explained the dramatic movement of the English Church Services. In the second he has made suggestions for their proper performance, which are wiser than some that we have heard from greater authority.

J. A. H. Bell.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

Sir,

J. R. LOWELL'S ATTITUDE TO WAR.

As a pacifist of long standing and a humble admirer of Lowell, may I point out that your memory played you false when you quoted, from the Biglow Papers, the words of the nameless 'candidate' and attributed his opinion about War to the poet who created him.

Turning over the pages of the book, it seemed to me that the characters give expression to the same different opinions which are held and expressed at the present time. Here are some of them:

Ez fer War, I call it murder—
There you hev it plain and flat:
I don't want to go no furder
Than my Testyment fer that;
God hez sed so plump an' fairly
It's ez long ez it is broad,
An' you've gut to git up airly
Ef you want to take in God.

'Taint your eppyletts an' feathers
Make the thing a grain more right;
'Taint afollerin' your bell-wethers
Will excuse ye in His sight;
Ef you take a sword an' dror it
An' go stick a feller thru,
Guv'ment aint to answer for it—
God'll send the bill to you.

Wut's the use o' meetin'-goin'
Every Sabbath, wet or dry,
If its right to go amowin'
Feller-men like oats and rye?
I dunno but wut its pooty
Trainin' round in botail coats—
But it's curus Christian dooty
This 'ere cuttin' folks's throats.

(*Mr. Hosea Biglow.*)

Parson Wilbur sez *he* never heerd in his life
Thet th' Apostles rigged out in their swaller-tail coats
An' marched round in front of a drum an' a fife,
To git some on 'em office, an' some on 'em votes.
But John P. Robinson he
'Sez they didn't know everythin' down in Judee.'

Or again:

We were gettin' on nicely up here to our village,
With good old idees o' wut's right an' wut aint;
We kind o' thought Christ went agin war an' pillage
An' thet eppyletts worn't the best mark of a saint.
But John P.
Robinson he
Sez this kind o' thing's an exploded idee.

The side of our country must ollers be took,
An' President Polk, you know, *he* is our country;
An' the angel that writes all our sins in a book
Puts the debit to him, an' to us the per contry.

(*What Mr. Robinson Thinks.*)

Ez for the war, I go agin it,
I mean to say I kind o' du—
That is I mean that, bein' in it,
The best way wuz to fight it thru;
Not but wut abstract war is horrid,
I sign to that with all my heart,
But civilyzation *doos* git forrid
Sometimes upon a powder cart.

(*The 'Candidate.'*)

But glory is a kin' o' thing I shan't pursue no furder,
Coz that's th' officers parquisite, yourn's on'y just the murder.
(*Mr. Birdofredom Sawin.*)

I du believe wutever trash
'll keep the people in blindness,
Thet we the Mexicans can thrash
Right inter brotherly kindness;
Thet bombshells, grape, an' powder 'n' ball
Air good-will's strongest magnets,
Thet peace, to make it stick at all,
Must be druv in with bagnets.
(*The Pious Editor's Creed.*)

If we read the poems from which these extracts are taken, note the characters of the speakers, and compare their opinions with Lowell's utterances (for instance, in the Elegy on the death of Dr. Channing and elsewhere), we cannot, I think, doubt what his own view was about the wickedness and worthlessness of war.

K. JAMESON
(M.A. Christ's College, formerly Chaplain of S. Edward the King, Cambridge.)

King's Croft, Cambridge.
July 9th, 1939.

[Our Cambridge Pacifist is right in charging us with error where we identify the view of one of Lowell's creations with the view of the poet himself, but our Cambridge Pacifist is himself in serious error when he writes:

'We cannot doubt what his own (Lowell's) view was of the wickedness and worthlessness of war.'

Lowell was not a pacifist. He condemned the Mexican War, to which period the poems cited above largely belong, but he was a strenuous supporter of the North in the Civil War of 1860-64, which he regarded from the Northern side as just and necessary.

We see this view expressed in noble verse in his war memorial poems, particularly in *Memoriae Positum* and in the Harvard Commemoration Ode, 1865.

'Ah, when the fight is won,
Dear Land, . . .
How nobler shall the sun
Flame in thy sky, how braver breathe thy air,
That thou breds't children who for thee could dare
And die as thine have done.' ED., *M.C.*]

DR. A. E. TAYLOR AND PROOFS OF A FUTURE LIFE.

SIR,

I have just read the critique on Professor A. E. Taylor's book on *The Christian Hope of Immortality*. Side by side with this I read in an article in the *Hibbert Journal*: 'Possibly a half of the mankind we know, or fewer, have their occasional dreams, wonderings, half-hopes — but transient and not followed up.' And so I ask myself whether such a book as this would seriously influence the beliefs of many about a future life.

The Professor shews the inconclusive nature of three usual types of argument, the empirical, ethical and metaphysical, and makes a new start from the consideration of the nature of personality. I doubt whether this is a new start, since from listening-in to many sermons at Eastertide it seemed

to me to be the line of approach most favoured by preachers; but I also had the impression that few people were much impressed by the argument. Perhaps a few scholars might be, but it means little, I think, to the average man.

It is, I think, quite certain that neither the Apostles nor St. Paul based their belief, which they held so strongly as to be able to communicate it to all their followers, on the argument founded on personality. They believed because of the Appearances to them of their Lord. I am bold enough to believe that this still constitutes the right line of approach to the average man or woman. I say *approach* advisedly. Long ago I said to a bishop, 'I don't believe you could speak to twenty people in a group but one of them would be able to tell of some remarkable experience in his life that he could not explain.' The bishop replied, 'I doubt that'; and then he proceeded to tell me of a very remarkable experience he himself had had. I replied, 'We are not twenty, but two, and yet one of us has had an experience of the kind I referred to.' Since then — and it is now many years ago — I have never failed to find when speaking in ordinary conversation to a group of people assembled by chance of not more than twenty, and usually very much less, that someone has come forward. My informants have included a Governor of a State, a Lord Chief Justice, a member of Parliament, a bishop, a diplomat, etc.

My belief is that these experiences are far more common than we suppose, for the reason that no one mentions them unless he or she feels that they are in a sympathetic environment. I have been often surprised at a man whom I thought an absolute materialist revealing to me some of these experiences. People seem to think that they are something to be ashamed of, or that to shew a belief in them is to be unorthodox, etc. The *Modern Churchman* itself has shewn little courage in tackling this side of the subject. The reason is of course obvious: it has been a fruitful ground for superstition, and the superstitious have been too often exploited by the vulgar charlatan.

I remember a theatrical manager once saying that (and this was many years ago, and then true) as few church people went to the theatre in Lent he put on his most doubtful plays then, and there would be no good people to be offended. The moral is obvious: if the best people go out of a business, the worst have it all their own way. If the wisest and most helpful people leave on one side all this business of curious experiences in the lives of people, those who want to follow up this line of thought, which can be most helpful, must fall into the hands of profiteers.

I am often told that it is very harmful for many people to have anything to do with such things, and I fully believe it. I have myself never been to a séance, and have no intention of ever going, because I could easily be fooled by clever rogues. But that is no reason why I should not follow closely what well-balanced people of repute who have carefully followed the subject have to say.

The Council for Psychic Research have done very valuable work, no doubt, but the average man knows little about that work, which does not seem to be put in a very popular form. I know, of course, that they have not been able to reach any very definite results — but then, has Professor Taylor? I think they really go further than he does. The old belief in a future life — which would appear to have been almost absolute — stood on the inerrancy of the Bible and the inerrancy of the Church. When vast numbers of people begin to doubt both, will the philosophers *alone* help us?

No doubt what Professor Taylor says is true: proof, if proof were forthcoming, of a survival for a time only—and that is all we are ever likely to

get — after death, would not be such a great deal if it meant to live on as pale shadows, as the Hebrews and as most primitive tribes seem to have believed. But I am certain of this, that if people had only the assurance that the spirit did most surely bridge the gulf of death, if only for a short time, they woud listen with far greater eagerness to all the theologian and the philosopher had to say about the possibilities of another world. To argue, as some do, that even if it were true that messages have been received from another world, their import is so mundane as not to be very encouraging, is beside the point: believers in evolution would hardly expect more at the beginning of the new life.

I hold no brief in this matter. I have not myself had any of these curious experiences to which I have referred, but knowing as I do how all but I believe a small handful earnestly desire to get all the knowledge they can about the possibilities of a future life, I feel that all avenues should be explored, and I cannot but feel that if the Church does not do this herself she should lend what help she can. A return to such a general belief in a future life would undoubtedly have an enormous effect on the morale of the world. What, indeed, would do more?

C. H. D. GRIMES.

Hôtel des Dunes et Southampton,
Rue Georges-Clemenceau, Dinard.

SIR,

PROFESSOR DODD AND DR. SCHWEITZER.

In his review of Otto's book, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man,* in the July number of the *Modern Churchman,* Mr. Kingdon observes that the author 'stops far short of the extreme absurdities of Schweitzer,' and goes on to say: 'We prefer to believe more on the lines of Professor Dodd that the Kingdom did come down to earth during the lifetime of Jesus, and above all through his self-sacrificing death.' No doubt we should all like to believe on these lines; but the question arises, did Jesus preach the Kingdom as having already come? Dr. Dodd, in his efforts at establishing his theory of 'realized eschatology,' assumes not only that 'the Messianic Age' and 'the Age to Come' are identical, but that in some sense 'the Age of Fulfilment' and 'the Kingdom of God' are one and the same. I think it was in his *Apostolic Preaching and its Development* that I came across the amazing statement, 'the fulfilment of prophecy means that the Day of the Lord has dawned: the age to come has begun.' So carried away is he by this 'realized eschatology' of his that he argues from the fact that St. Peter is represented in the *Acts* as quoting *Joel* ii, 28-32, that the Age of Fulfilment had dawned, and, as a corollary, that the Kingdom of God had come! Unfortunately Joel's prophecy is not concerned with 'the age to come,' but with the last days immediately preceding the Day of the Lord.

Despite the popularity Professor Dodd's theory is enjoying to-day, I consider that the bulk of the evidence is on the side of Schweitzer, and that 'realized eschatology' is the eschatology of those two saints, Paul and Luke, who, by spiritual experience and cold facts, were forced into a restatement of the Baptist-Jesus κήρυγμα.

T. E. WARNER.

Driffield, Yorks.

CORRECTIONS.

We regret that the following misprints occurred in Dr. Stanley Cook's article in the Conference Number of the *Modern Churchman*:

p. 312, line 12 from end: *Caud* for *Caird*;
ibid., line 4 from end, : *net* for *act*.

ED., *M.C.*